

THE RĀSHṬRAKŪṬAS AND THEIR NORTHERN CONTEMPORARIES

The history of the Rāshṭrakūṭas in relation to their north-Indian contemporaries — The Gurjara-Pratihāras and Pālas is one of perpetual clash and conflict lasting over several generations. It was not only an attempt to establish supremacy by this southern power over its northern counterparts, but also to contain the expansionist move of the Pratihāras in the north alone. It was evidently an experiment and exercise in armed diplomacy and clever manoeuvring. Geographical factors no doubt stood in the way of any power holding the other one in perpetual hegemony. The results despite long struggles were indecisive, and both the Pratihāras and the Rāshṭrakūṭas reigned supreme in their respective areas. The Pālas who at one time enjoyed the patronage and friendship were not spared either, and they also faced the brunt of the Pratihāra onslaught of course with a minor shrinkage of their territory without losing their independence. A study of this tripartite struggle in the context of Rāshṭrakūṭa history could be made on the basis of the available epigraphic source material. Reference might as well be made to the Rāshṭrakūṭa attitude towards the Arabs who were firmly entrenched in Sindh. In this area, too, the approach of this southern power was one of maintaining friendly relations with them. On the other hand, the Pratihāras, with their great ruler Bhoja in particular, were enimical towards the Arabs. This inter-play of forces highlights the history of the Deccan in relation to that of the North for about two centuries.

Dantidurga (c. A.D. 735-55), the founder of the Rāshṭrakūṭa empire, originally the feudatory of the Chālukyan ruler Vikramāditya II, availed of the opportunity of his suzerain's death in AD 747, to fruition his political ambitions. Clever in his diplomatic moves as also in his mili-

* Retd. Professor and Head of the Department of Ancient Indian History & Archaeology, Lucknow University.

tary exploits, Dantidurga had his encounters against the Gurjara kingdom of Nandīpurī and the Chālukyan one of Navasāri which he annexed to his growing kingdom. Southern Gujarat was given by him to his cousin Govinda, son of Dhruva, while central Gujarat annexed to his kingdom served as the base for his northern expedition towards Malwa. He defeated the Gurjara king who was made to serve as the door keeper in his *Hiranyagarbhadāna*¹ ritual. It seems that the Rāshtrakūṭa ruler was not interested in annexing the Gurjara kingdom, as the line continued hereafter. This was followed by the Rāshtrakūṭa ruler's march towards Berar and Mahākośala and thence Kalinga, as is evident from his Samangad plates². The whole of the Madhya Pradesh and central and southern Gujarāt, thus, came under his political influence or very likely under his subjugation. His expanding power and influence eventually landed him into conflict with his so-called Chālukya suzerain line and its ruler Kīrtivarman II lost to him. The Chālukyan power was not eliminated and it survived the shock. Dantidurga's death, sometime in A.D. 755, no doubt, put a halt to the Rāshtrakūṭa expansionist zeal, but only temporarily. Krishṇa I, successor and uncle of Dantidurga, soon afterwards defeated the Chālukyan adversary and put an end to the

1. EI. 18.252. This record of Amoghavarsha, dated in the Saka Samvat 793, was discovered in the Thana district of the Maharashtra State. It is important for showing the contemporaneity of the Rāshtrakūṭa king Govinda III, the Pratihāra ruler Nagābhata, Chakrāyudha of Kanauj and the Gauḍa king Dharmapala (cf. JBBRAS. 22.116). The Ellora plates of Dantidurga, the earliest record of the family, are dated in Sam. 663, very possibly of the Saka era, corresponding to A.D. 742 (EI. 21.26). Mirashi, on the other hand, reads the date as 463 in the Kalachuri era of A.D. 250-51 (*Proceedings - Oriental Congress*, XV, Summary of Papers 97-98), thus pushing his accession to $463 + 250 =$ A.D. 713 or more than 25 years. His Samangad Grant (IA. 11.108) is dated in the year 675, A.D. 753-54, thus suggesting that he ruled for more than forty years in case Mirashi's contention is accepted. According to D. R. Bhandarkar, the reference to the *Hiranyagarbha* ceremony being performed by Dantidurga at Ujjainī, as recorded in the Sanjan plates, and the Gurjara lord being made the door-keeper, is confirmed from a stanza occurring in the Daśāvatara cave temple inscription at Ellora (Ar. sur. west. India, V, p. 88). This inscription gives Mahārāja Sarva as another name apparently for Dantidurga, and claims that in that very Ujjain, in order to enjoy a diversion with other princes, he instituted a *mahādāna* worthy of kings (*op. cit.*, p. 239).

2. EI. 11.108. It is suggested by Altekar that the varied and valuable military experience acquired by Dantidurga in the course of expeditions in the south and north and the victories, proved an asset to him. Soon after his return from Kāñchī in c. A.D. 744, he launched his scheme of conquest. The death of the Chālukyan emperor in A.D. 747 helped his plans. Dantidurga who was related to the Chālukyas on the maternal side, and his patrimonial principality lying in Berar and western Madhya Pradesh, he decided to extend his territory towards the east and west so as to excite the least possible apprehension in the mind of the Chālukyan emperor. After annexing Central Gujarat, Dantidurga invaded Malwa then under the Gurjara-Pratihāras where there was a feud at that time between Siluka and Devarāja. Taking advantage of the situation Dantidurga marched on Ujjainī and brought it under his sway. The invasion of Malwa was of the nature of a raid, and did not annex it (*Early History of the Deccan*, EHD., ed. Yazdani, Vol. I, p. 254).

Chālukyan line³. The Rāshtrakūṭas now became masters of Mahārāshtra and northern Kārnāṭaka.

The next ruler to take up cudgels against the rulers of the North was Dhruva Dhāravarsha (c 780-93) who had wrested the kingdom from his brother Govinda I and was evidently keen to expand his area of influence. His victories in the south consolidated his position and he could afford to have an eye on the kingdoms in the north. Rajputana and Malwa in close proximity to his expanding power was the target for him. Its ruler at that time was the Gurjara-Pratihāra king Vatsarāja — no less ambitious. Earlier he had taken up the cause of Govinda I against Dhruva at the Rāshtrakūṭa domestic front. This was the natural cause for animosity between the two. Further, Vatsarāja had an eye on Kanauj, then under a weakling Indrāyudha. He marched against him and defeated him, but allowed the latter to continue as a protégé. Kanauj became a bone of contention between the Pratihāra king Vatsarāja and the Pāla ruler Dharmapāla who espoused the interest of another contender Chakrāyudha. In the battle that ensued the Bengal army was defeated and Vatsarāja carried away the two white umbrellas as trophies. Dharmapāla soon decided to make another attempt and the time coincided with Dhruva's northern expedition under his sons Govinda and Indrarāja. The Rāshtrakūṭa army succeeded in defeating the Pratihāra forces compelling Vatsarāja to seek refuge in Rajputana and part with the two white umbrellas earlier annexed from the Pāla ruler. Dhruva did not spare Dharmapāla either and defeated him. The two victories no doubt elevated the prestige of the Rāshtrakūṭa monarch, but without any territorial gain in Northern India.

According to the Wani and Radhanpur⁴ inscriptions of the time of Govinda III, Vatsarāja was driven into the tractless desert by Dhruva (Dhruva) who took away from him not merely the two Gauḍa umbrellas at stake, but also his fame (*tad yaso'pi kakubham prānti sthitam tatkaṣaṇāt*, v. 8). There is an additional verse in the Radhanpur grant which refers to the defeat of the Gurjara by Govinda resulting in the complete disappearance of the Gurjara (*Gurjaro naṣṭaḥ kv=āpi bhayāt=tathā na samaram svapne'pi paśyād=yathā*, v. 15). In this context it might be necessary to refer to the defeat of the Gauḍa ruler by Dhruva in this record which places his march up to the Doab (*Gaṅgā-Yamunayor-madhye rājño=Gauḍasya nasyataḥ-Sanjan*, v. 14). The Baroda plates of Karka-

3. Soon after putting down the revolt of Karkka, Krishṇa proceeded to overthrow the Chālukyan power under Kirttivarman II, who had reorganised his forces. Krishṇa inflicted a crushing defeat on Kirttivarman who seems to have died in the battle, and with that ended the Chālukyan dynasty (EHD., p. 259).

4. Wani (IA. 11.156); Radhanpur (EI. 6.239).

rāja⁵ also refer to the defeat of the Gauda king at the hands of the Rāshtrakūṭa ruler Govind III. The four lines referring to this fact have been interpreted differently by scholars. Fleet editing the record considers the first two lines as referring to Govinda III, and this view is endorsed by R. P. Chanda⁶. R. C. Majumdar, however, suggests⁷ that the last line clearly points to Dhruva and not to Govindarāja. It seems that Dhruva's conquest of Vatsarāja's territory driving him into the desert, and the defeat of the Gauda ruler by the Rāshtrakūṭa emperor took place between A.D. 783 and 794, very probably in close succession.

According to the Paithan inscription⁸, Govinda III ascended the throne in A.D. 794 and his succession being disturbed⁹, both Vatsarāja and Dharmapāla once again aspired for supremacy. Govinda III seems to have waited for quite some time stabilising his position at home, before taking up cudgels against his northern adversaries. In the meanwhile both Vatsarāja and Dharmapāla had equally prepared themselves for their territorial expansions. Dharmapāla had succeeded in placing his protégé Chakrāyana on the Kanauj throne. Vatsarāja, it seems, lost to the Pālas and was equally unsuccessful against the Rāshtrakūṭas. The next Gurjara-Pratihāra ruler Nāgabhaṭa, the real founder of the Pratihāra line of Kanauj, who was also successful against his Bengala contemporary, seems to have lost against the Rāshtrakūṭa ruler Govinda III in the second encounter which the latter had against the Gurjara lord. The Sanjan copper plate inscription of his son Amoghavarsha, refers to the fair and unshakable fame of Nāgabhaṭa and Chandragupta being carried away in battle (*Sa Nāgabhaṭa Candragupta nripayor=yaśor'yam raṇeṣv=dhāryam-dhairyam=vikalān=ath=onmūlyat*, v. 23).

5. IA. 12.170. The four important lines referring to this event may be quoted in original: *Yō Gaṅgā-Yamune taraṅga-subhāge grihanān=parēbhyaḥ samam śākṣāccih nanibhena c=ottam-padam tat=prāptavān=aśvaram, deh-āsammita-vaibhavair-iva guṇair=vyāśya-bhrahmadbhīr-ādiso. vyāptās=tasya babhūva kīrti-puruṣo Govindarājah sutaḥ.*

6. *Manasi*, 7.539.

7. EI. 18.194n. According to Majumdar, Dharmapāla completed his imperial fabric during the period intervening between the retirement of Dhruva and the reappearance of his son Govinda III in the north. These two events may be dated approximately at 780 and 800 A.D. (*History of Bengal*, HB., 1971, p. 106).

8. EI. 3.103.

9. According to Fleet, Govind's accession appears to have been attended by opposition; for, the passage which mentions his being invested by his father with the *kaṇṭhika* of yuvarājaship is followed immediately by one which related how, on his father's death, he had to contend against a confederacy of twelve kings, who had combined together to acquire the possession of the whole earth, and who apparently were led by a person named Stambha (B.G.I. 395). Altekar, however, presumes that the accession of Govinda took place peacefully and for a long time there was no trouble (EHD. 266).

It seems that there were several engagements between Govinda III and his northern contemporaries¹⁰. The Rāshtrakūṭa rulers seem to be content with their submission, but as soon as the lord of the South was engrossed in his Deccan campaign, Nāgabhaṭa availed of the opportunity to assert his power and prerogative over his neighbours. He had the support of his own allies — Kakka from Jodhpur, Bāhukadhavala from Kathiawar and very probably Saṅkaragaṇa of the Cātsu inscription¹¹ who is recorded to have conquered the Gauḍa country and presented it to his overlord. It is suggested by Dr. Majumdar that the Pratihāra ruler was not destined to enjoy the fruits of his victory, and once again, the dream of founding a Pratihāra empire was shattered by the Rāshtrakūṭas.

It is, however, clear from the Baroda plate of Karkarāja that the Gurjara conquest of Bengal did happen and the danger from the puffed up Gurjara lord of the north did remain. It seems that Govinda III had neither the time nor the resources adequate enough to undertake, probably, the third incursion into the north. Before his death in A.D. 814, the Rāshtrakūṭa ruler was too busy, and had only to prop up his feudatory Karkarāja to keep an eye on the affairs in the north by protecting the ruler of Malwa¹². Dr. Majumdar himself admits earlier that ere long the political situation changed, the Rāshtrakūṭas themselves were torn asunder by internal dissensions. Karkarāja, the son and successor of Indrarāja of Lāṭa, was expelled by his younger brother in A.D. 812, and what was still worse, the revolutionary movement, thus set on foot, afterwards developed into an attempt to prevent the accession of

10. The chronology of the campaigns of Govinda III is discussed by Altekar and Mirashi in *D. R. Bhandarkar Volume*, 153 ff., and EI. 23.214 ff. and 293 ff. respectively. Altekar has reconsidered his views in the *Age of Imperial Kanauj* (Bhavan's *History & Culture of the Indian People*, Vol. IV, p. 7; and also in EI. 23.159). For a long time it was believed that Govinda's campaign in the north took place about A.D. 806 or 807. But it is now generally held that all these conquests were achieved before A.D. 802, most probably in A.D. 800 since this expedition is mentioned in the Manne plates of Stambha (EHD. 268n). The Sanjan charter of Amoghavarsha I supplies detailed information for reconstructing the various stages of the expedition to the north with reasonable certainty.

11. We learn from this record (EI. 15.14) of Bālāditya that Saṅkaragaṇa, son of Krishnarāja who conquered Bhāṭa, king of the Gauḍa country made the present of this kingdom to his overlord (vv. 14-16). The Jodhpur inscription of the Pratihāra chief Bāuka informs us that his father had gained fame by fighting with the Gauḍas at Mudgagiri i.e. Monghyr (EI. 18.98). Vāhukadhavala, probably a feudatory chief of the Pratihāras, is said to have defeated a king called Dharva (i.e. Dharmapala) EI. 9.7. According to Majumdar, it is not improbable that in this dire necessity Dharmapala invoked the aid of the Rāshtrakūṭa king against the common enemy (*History of Bengal*, p. 107). Altekar also notices this possibility (EHD. I.269).

12. The Baroda grant No. 5, after describing Indrarāja, mentions his son Karkarāja, with the *biruda* of Suvarṇavarsha, «the rainer of gold», also styled as Lāṭesvara, or «lord of Lāṭa». It says that he protected the king of Malwa against a lord of the Gurjaras who had become evilly inflamed by conquering the lords of Gauḍa and Vaṅga (B.G.I. 100).

Amoghavarsha. This unexpected void in the Rāshtrakūṭa affairs left the Pālas and the Gurjaras free to measure their strength. The Gurjara Pratihāras were triumphant, and it is this family alone which posed a danger to the Rāshtrakūṭas in the subsequent contemporary history.

The relations between Bhoja and the Rāshtrakūṭa rulers — Amoghavarsha and Kriṣṇa II can be traced in three phrases. The first one was marked with inactivity on both the sides, the second one is characterised with indirect clash — the main line probably allying itself with the feudatory one of Gujārāt against the Gurjara-Pratihāras. The third phase was noted for some form of understanding between the two powers through some intermediary. In the first stage Amoghavarsha, whose succession was disputed, had to encounter a number of revolts which he tried to contain. The records suggest that he was engaged in destroying his enemies and recovering back his kingdom which had fallen off and was tottering¹³. He had, therefore, little opportunity to concentrate on the North. The Sirur inscription, however, suggests that the kings of Aṅga, Vaṅga, Magadha, Mālava and Veṅgī worshipped him¹⁴. This assertion is not confirmed by any other source and appears to be vague. There is no reference to the northern incursion of this ruler in any record of Amoghavarsha. The clash between the branch line of the Rāshtrakūṭas of Gujārāt and the Gurjaras is mentioned in the Bagumra inscription of Dhruvarāja, a grant of Kriṣṇarāja and another of Indra from the same place¹⁵. The first record mentions that Dhruva III, the donor of the grant, had trouble from hostile elements. He was assailed by a powerful army of the Gurjaras with whom an unnamed younger brother of his had allied himself (v. 38). The inscription also refers to a king Mihira who, though united to fortune by a crowd of noble kinsmen and with courage conquered all the regions of the world, nevertheless disappeared with his face covered with dark-

13. The Sanjan plate issued on the 13th day of May A.D. 821, describes the restoration of Amoghavarsha to the throne, brought about by the exertions of Karka (ALTEKAR, *Rāshtrakūṭas*, p. 74). It appears from the Konnur Inscription of Amoghavarsha I, that the reign of this ruler was marked by three revolts, challenging the imperial authority. The first one broke out when he was a child, the second one at the time of his engagement against his Gujarat cousins, and the third one sometime later — all before A.D. 860. The details of these are not given but the third one was very serious (EI. 6.30). According to the Sanjan plate dated in Sam 783 = A.D. 861, when Amoghavarsha ascended the throne, some of his feudatories, ministers and relations became disappointed and raised the standard of revolt (EI. 10.238, vv. 35-36).

14. IA. 12.219. The reference to the rulers of north acknowledging his suzerainty seems rather vague and is not confirmed from other sources. Aṅga, Vaṅga and Magadha formed part of the Pāla kingdom under Devapāla. In fact, the Badal inscription refers to the defeat of a Draviḍa ruler, at the hands of Devapāla. This ruler is supposed to be Amoghavarsha (ALTEKAR, *Rāshtrakūṭas*, p. 77; endorsed by Majumdar, HB. 180n).

15. Bagumra Grant S'789 = A.D. 867 (IA. 12.179); another one dated in S'810 = A.D. 888 (IA. 13.65); and the third one dated in S'836 = A.D. 914 (EI. 9.24).

ness. Eventually this refers to the defeat of a very strong and powerful ruler at the hands of a Rāshtrakūṭa feudatory (*mahāsāmantādhipati*) representing the Branch line at Gujarāt. It is very likely that the branch line forces had joined hands with those of the main line in the life time of Amoghavarsha against the traditional Gurjara-Pratihāras of the north. This record is dated in the Śaka year 789 = A.D. 867 when both Bhoja I and Amoghavarsha were alive.

A grant of Krishṇarāja of A.D. 888 discovered with the earlier one mentions some prince vanquishing his enemies at Ujjayinī before the eyes of king Vallabha who is identified with Amoghavarsha of the main line. The third record from the same place dated in A.D. 914 records old men vividly remembering at that time the brave feats of the Rāshtrakūṭa emperors in the sanguinary wars with the Gujaras. The crown prince Jagatuṅga also participated in these wars and so did the Chedi ruler with whom the Rāshtrakūṭas had established matrimonial relations. The Barton Museum¹⁶ inscription, however, refers to Krishṇarāja hastily retreating to his country. These records, thus, point to the indecisive nature of the clashes between the Gurjara-Pratihāras and the Rāshtrakūṭas, along with their feudatories and allies. Bhoja had to retreat but he never gave up his ambition to conquer the South. The Gwalior inscription of V.S. 932 = A.D. 875 suggests that he was still wishing to conquer the three worlds (*śrīmad-Ādivarāheṇa trailokyam vijigusunā*). It may, therefore, be proposed that Bhoja retreated from the south sometime before A.D. 867, and at the time of the Gwalior record he was still anxious to wage another war in the south. With the help of his feudatory in Kathiawar, Bhoja forced Karkarāja to retreat hastily to his country. Later on, the Pratihāra ruler had an uncomfortable position with Śaṅkarvarman of Kashmir wresting the Ṭakka land (Punjab) from the Gurjara-Pratihāras and Krishṇarāja defeating the Gurjara forces at Ujjayinī. The prestige of this great ruler of Northern India was down, if not completely lost. The loss at the north-western end seems to have been compensated with the addition of some territory in the east consequent to Pratihāra's success against the Pālas, while the situation in the south was fluid and politically indecisive and undetermined.

The next stage in the Rāshtrakūṭa-Gurjara-Pratihāra confrontation was in the time of Mahīpāla whose succession had involved many forces in two warring camps. The old Chedi ruler had taken up the cause of

16. EI. 19.174. The struggle between the Gurjara-Pratihāras and the Rāshtrakūṭas feudatory line of Gujarat no doubt supported by Amoghavarsha, seems to be indecisive. The Gwalior inscription VS. 932 = A.D. 875 of Bhoja suggests that he was still wishing to conquer the three worlds (*trailokyam vijigusunā*). The grant of Krishṇarāja of Ankuleśvara, however, points to the defeat of the Gurjara king at Ujjayinī. According to Altekar, there is some pardonable exaggeration in the claim. The Rāshtrakūṭas and the Pratihāras do not appear to have come into conflict again during the reign of Amoghavarsha I (EHD. I.278).

Bhoja II against Mahīpāla and he had the support of the Rāshtrakūṭa Krishṇa II¹⁷. According to the Cambay plate inscription of Govinda IV, Indra III after crossing Yamunā, devastated the holy city of Mahodaya, also known as Kausthalī. It is proposed that Indra III carried on this campaign in the time of his grandfather Krishṇa II whom he succeeded. The reign of Indra III was a short one lasting for about three years from A.D. 915-918, and in this space of time his involvements deterred him from taking any more interest in northern affairs. The Chedi-Rāshtrakūṭa protégé, Bhoja II had an uncomfortable and brief reign and had to pave the way for Mahīpāla whose authority was acknowledged by Dharanivarāha in Kathiawar, and had the backing of the Chandella king Harshadeva. If the evidence from the *Prachāṇḍa-Pāṇḍava*¹⁸ recording the conquest of Mahīpāla has any relevance to the digvijaya of this Gurjara-Pratihāra ruler, then Kuntala representing probably portions of the Rāshtrakūṭa empire, was included in it. It is quite likely that troubles in the Rāshtrakūṭa camp facilitated Pratihāra ruler's success in the south. The Mohammadan historian Al-Masudi admits¹⁹ the greatness of this ruler of Kanauj whose empire included the highlands of Sind, the source of the Mihiran. The conquest of the Karnāṭaka region by Mahīpāla is also narrated by Kshemiśvara in his *Chandakausikam*²⁰. In case the identity of the two Mahīpālas — the hero of the play with the Pratihāra ruler — is accepted — the defeat of the Rāshtrakūṭa ruler — included in the conquests of the southern region — stands proved. There is, however, no reference to this fact in the Rāshtrakūṭa records.

The confrontation between the two empirical forces — that of the Pratihāras and the Rāshtrakūṭas — did not end with Mahīpāla and Indra III and his successor. We learn from the Karhad and the Deoli

17. The Rāshtrakūṭa records suggest that Indra III conducted a campaign against the Pratihāra dominions sometime between A.D. 915 and 918. The Rāshtrakūṭa ruler advanced through Malwa, crossed the Yamunā and completely devastated the city of Kanauj. The Kanarese poem, *Pampabhārata* associates the Chālukyan feudatory Narasiṃha with this campaign. It says that Mahīpāla fled, as if struck by thunderbolts, staying neither to eat, nor rest, nor pick himself up, while Narasiṃha, pursuing bathed his horses at the junction of the Ganga (ALTEKAR, *Rāshtrakūṭas* 101-2; *The Age of Kanauj*, p. 36).

18. I.17. The verse runs as follows:

*Namita-Murala-mauliḥ pākalo Mekalānāḥ
raṇa-kalita-kaliṅgaḥ keli taṭa keralendoḥ
Ajani-jita kulutaḥ kuntalānāḥ kuṭhāraḥ
haṭha-hṛita-Ramaṭha-S'riḥ S'rī Mahipaladevaḥ.*

19. ELIOT and DOWSON, *History of India as told by its Historians*, Vol. I.21.

20. Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara edition p. 5. The passage in the prologue of Kshemiśvara's drama may be quoted here: *Yāḥ Saṃs'ritya prakṛit gahanām-ārya Cānakya-nītiṃ jīvā Nandān Kusumnagaraṃ Candragupto jigāya. Karnāṭatvaṃ dhruvam-upagataḥ-adya-tāneva hanturīḥ dor-darpādhyāḥ sa punar-abhayac-cri-Mahīpaladevaḥ*. Some scholars have identified this Mahīpāla with the Pāla ruler (IC. 2.797; 2.354; Śāstri: JOR. 6.191-98). Dr. Majumdar admits that in the absence of further particulars, the probability is that king Mahīpāla of the *Chandakausikam* may be identified with the Pratihāra ruler of Kanauj (*History of Bengal*, 1st ed., pp. 149-50; 1971, ed., p. 137).

plates that Krishṇa conquered the forts of Kālañjara and Chitrakūṭa which were situated in the very heart of the Chandella countries. A verse from the Karhad²¹ plate (v. 30) suggests that on hearing of the conquest of all the strong holds in the southern region, simply by means of angry glance, the hope about Kālañjara and Chitrakūṭa vanished from the hearts of the Gurjaras. This incident seems to have happened under Vināyaka-pāla and at that time the relations of the Pratihāras with the Chandellas were quite cordial. The Chandellas seem to have recovered the fort of Kālañjara from the Rāshtrakūṭas, probably for the Gurjara-Pratihāras to whom they were paying allegiance, more or less nominally. In c. 963 Krishṇa led a second expedition into Northern India²² in which he was also assisted by Narasiṃha, the successor of the Gāṅga ruler Butuga. He seems to have marched into Bundelkhand and later on led an expedition against the Paramāra ruler Siyaka and occupied Ujjayinī.

The Rāshtrakūṭa ascendancy in the Deccan from A.D. 753 to 975 is an important landmark in the Deccan noted for military expeditions against the rulers of the north and also those of the south, more for establishing political hegemony than for expansion and political domination. Dhruva, Govinda III and Indra III along with their allies and feudatories had successfully taken up cudgels against Vatsarāja, Nāgabhaṭa, Bhoja and later on the Rāshtrakūṭas also interfered in the war of succession following Mahendrapāla's death. Nāgabhaṭa, Bhoja and Mahipāla, too, retrieved the lost position and they tried to wield their political influence in other directions and also in the south. It is, no doubt, true that in the interplay of political forces both at the military level as well as at the diplomatic one, the Rāshtrakūṭas were more successful. The Rāshtrakūṭas paved the way for the Chālukyas while the Pratihāras succumbed before the onslaught of internal and external forces. There were no permanent friends nor equally permanent enemies. The Chandellas, once a feudatory, laid a conspiracy to kill Rājya-pāla and they were successful. The indecisive nature of the Pratihāra-Rāshtrakūṭa confrontation ended only with the end of the two ruling families — the southern one slightly half a century earlier while the northern one only lingered on for some time, till it was finally swept away by the Ghazni invasion.

21. EI. IV.282.

22. The details of this expedition are not known. A Kanarese inscription from Jura in Bundelkhand eulogizes Krishṇa and describes him as the conqueror of Kanchi and Tanjore (EI. 5.176). It is likely that Krishṇa may have aimed at the recapture of the forts of Kālingar and Chitrakūṭa. It is proposed by Altekar that he had to attack not only the Gurjara-Pratihāras, but also the Paramāras of Malwā, whose ruler Siyaka had rebelled (EHD. I.296).